UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/532,625	04/25/2005	Johannes Schaller	R.304062	7070
2119 RONALD E. G	7590 03/26/200 REIGG	EXAMINER		
	EIGG P.L.L.C.	VANOY, TIMOTHY C		
ALEXANDRIA	TAN STREET, UNIT ONE A, VA 22314		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1793	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/26/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/532,625	SCHALLER ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	TIMOTHY C. VANOY	1793		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appeariod for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailine earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>22 J</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This Since this application is in condition for allowated closed in accordance with the practice under the process.	s action is non-final. ince except for formal matters, pro			
Disposition of Claims				
4) ☐ Claim(s) 14-33 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 14-33 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or application Papers 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	own from consideration. or election requirement.			
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 25 April 2005 is/are: a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E) accepted or b) objected to drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See tion is required if the drawing(s) is objection	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). lected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate		

Art Unit: 1793

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

The person having ordinary skill in the art has the capability of understanding the scientific and engineering principles applicable to the claimed invention. The references of record in this application reasonably reflect this level of skill.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 14-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the English abstract of DE 199 35 920 A1 to Weigl

The English abstract of DE-920 describes a method for treating the exhaust gas emitted from an internal combustion engine by providing a heating element in the reduction agent reservoir container, which reliably prevents freezing of the reduction agent stored in the reservoir container.

The difference between the applicants' claims and DE-920 is that DE-920 does not mention that the heating of the reduction agent results in a partial chemical conversion of the reduction agent.

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made *to have further described* the process and apparatus set forth in DE-920 *by setting forth* that the reducing agent undergoes a chemical conversion (as a consequence of the heating), in the manner set forth in the applicants' claims, *because* no distinction is seen or has been shown between the actual temperatures that the Applicants' and DE-920 heat the urea, such that "chemical conversion" is also expected to inherently occur in the process and apparatus of DE-920 (because the heating temperatures appear to be the same).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments submitted with the Amendment filed on Jan. 22, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

a) The Applicants argue that Weigl discloses the use of a heating element 12 for the purpose of preventing freezing of the reducing agent in the tank 10, not for the purpose of stimulating a partial chemical conversion of the auxiliary agent.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further described the process and apparatus set forth in DE-920 by setting forth that the reducing agent undergoes a chemical conversion (as a consequence of the heating), in the manner set forth in the applicants' claims, because no distinction is seen or has been shown between the actual temperatures that the Applicants' and DE-920 heat the urea, such that "chemical conversion" is also expected to inherently occur in the process and apparatus of DE-920 (because the heating temperatures appear to be the same).

b) The Applicants comments regarding US 2004/0115110 A1 to Ripper et al. are found persuasive.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TIMOTHY C. VANOY whose telephone number is (571)272-8158. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stanley Silverman, can be reached on 571-272-1358. The fax phone

Application/Control Number: 10/532,625 Page 5

Art Unit: 1793

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Timothy C Vanoy Primary Examiner Art Unit 1793

tcv

/Timothy C Vanoy/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1793